

**REMARKS**

The Official Action of September 1, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims **1-14**, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 13 and 14 have been added and claims 3-11 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either Meetze or Piper. Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections as applied to claims 1, 2 and 12 as amended and to new claims 13 and 14.

The claimed invention is directed to a chopping board including a main body having a plurality of plastic planks stacked in abutment to each other and a cover layer made of thermoplastic rubber fused to the total surface area of the periphery of the main body so as to hold the planks in abutment and to prevent water and dust running between the planks when the chopping board is in use. The thermoplastic

rubber cover layer also permits a user to cut through the cover layer to dispose of the uppermost plank when no longer useable.

The cited prior art patents are clearly directed to solving completely different problems than that of the claimed invention.

Meetze is directed to maintaining a stack of outputted printed copy sheets 11 temporarily but securely bound together after exiting a printer or fax machine. This is accomplished by small adhesive tape segments, much smaller than the sheets, being fastened partially around each of two opposing sides of the stack.

Clearly, there is no teaching that the sheets are plastic, the cover layer is thermoplastic rubber or that the cover layer is fused over a total surface area of the periphery of the stack 11. As such, it is clear that Meetze cannot achieve the intended purpose of the claimed invention.

Piper is equally irrelevant, as it is directed to multiplayer ceramic capacitors (not plastic) having end metallization coatings comprising fired-on silver-frit coatings (not thermoplastic rubber) comprising fired-on silver-frit coatings contacting the internal electrode,

exposed at each end of the capacitor (and not a total surface area of the periphery of the multilayer ceramic capacitors).

As such, it is clear that Piper also cannot achieve the intended purpose of the claimed inventions. Applicant further notes that the layers of the piper multilayer ceramic capacitors are "sintered" together and therefore are not merely in abutment to each other as claimed by Applicant (see column 3, lines 47-50 of Piper).

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention clearly patentably defines over the cited prior art and accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 12-14 are allowable.

FROM :

JAN. 3. 2006 4:40PM

PHONE NO. :  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK

Jan. 03 2006 07:33PM P2

Appl. No. 10/689,066  
Amdt. dated January 3, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 1, 2005


The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By

  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma/  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BP\p\dire\chang213\Amendment-A.doc